RDT 2025 Call 3.2

In this next piece of this particular call, I didn't want to make the last one too long, because it's difficult to sort of shift gears between these different modes. As I'm thinking through the book, you know, we have this call separated into kind of four distinct areas of concern in this R&D process. The reason why AI will change everything is, of course, IMO, in other words, Important, Motivating, Urgent, Leverage, and Low-Hanging Fruit, and a double-edged sword of inquiry.

In other words, no matter how much AI does what it does, and I hear people complaining everywhere about how bad AI is, but it's like I heard a guy say the other night, it doesn't really matter. It's going to be ubiquitous anyway, good or bad. It's kind of like politics.

Politics, you can say is good or bad, but it's ubiquitous. So this is the thing that we have to get to where we understand is, is that it's coming, and we've got to do what it is we've got to do. At the same time, inquiry is going to help us.

In other words, it's going to make things work. When we talk about VUCA, again, I'm using that term just to not have to say all this thing about complexity. It's the quality of solutions at a more complex level, rather than the quantity of solutions at a less complex level.

In other words, the reason to use inquiry, which is what I'm trying to nail down in the book, in terms of the skills, is somebody will say, well, why don't you just talk to people? Why don't you just ask them questions and stuff? The reason why you want to develop all these skills, these different skills, instead of just interrogatory, who, what, when, where, why, and how, is you want to be able to understand where people are, and more specifically, where the problem is that they're trying to solve, because you will get matches and mismatches that become very apparent, and you have a different kind of problem then. In other words, if you have a mismatch between where someone is and the type of problem that they're trying to solve, that's a different kind of problem than understanding where people are and what it is they're doing, their story, and all of that. In other words, if there's a mismatch between the fit and complexity, or a mismatch between the fit and skill, or a mismatch between the requirements and the behavior, those are different problems, and so this is why it's really important to look at why we've developed all these different skills with which to be able to do that.

I mean, it's just like a surgeon. They don't use just one tool. They use all kinds of tools, depending on what it is they find, and that's exactly what we're doing.

We just found that seven will work pretty well. Once you get past that, you sort of get into subcategories and stuff like that, but how do we know and leverage the difference? Well, identifying purpose at the individual team and organizational levels, or these networks, is pretty important because it takes us back into the system recursively to try to understand. Remember, problems are emergent.

They're coming from something. They're not just there because we don't have to accept problems as they are. We can walk away from them, as I mentioned in the first segment.

You can just walk away from complex problems unless you can't, and then, of course, we want to be in a situation to prevent that problem, which is a lot easier than solving it because it costs my team money, information, time, energy, attention, and resources, or motivation resources to solve a problem. If you prevent it, you don't have to solve it, which means it's much more conservative in terms of energy and information. So I just listed the seven Ps right there just for people coming in and hearing this only video and saying, what is he talking about in terms of seven skills? There they are, and there's their objects to help you remember them.

Okay, I just put them there. Now, when we're talking about the actual course itself, this breaks into the next segment. In other words, when I look at what has been the tipping point in AI, the tipping point is actually having the AI give better responses, generate better responses, responses that are more like what humans would generate.

Not that that's a good category of responses, but the idea would be the time it takes. That's what we're doing in terms of dynamic inquiry system skills. We're actually improving the reading time, the thinking time, the translation of feelings into reason, the transformation of irrational and rational thought and feelings into some kind of story or narrative that guides us to help understand where people are.

And then, of course, is the problem there, too. Most of the time, people have problems because they're not where the problem is. I know that seems like a very trite statement, but that's very important.

Knowing where the problem is and knowing where people are and noting if there's a mismatch, either vertical or lateral in terms of skills or oblique in terms of application, that's very important. We use these skills to be able to do that. This is, again, just making sure on one hand you keep it simple and eliminating the noise by focusing the message for each person.

Well, how do you do that? Well, you've got to understand something about their purpose. In other words, everybody has a purpose, and they have a path of purpose, and they have purposes that are little purposes that make a big purpose. So someone coming in to make a deposit in a bank has a purpose, but making a deposit is probably not the real purpose.

The deeper purpose would be making a deposit so they have money for X or Y or Z or their kids or their future or whatever. So very important to understand that. One of the things in Lessons of History, which I so love because I didn't have to read the story of civilization to get the gist of it.

The story of civilization, as I've mentioned, is very big, and they won a Pulitzer Prize. I think he won it, but I think they should have won it. Ariel was probably as important, if not more so, than William Durant.

And this is a quote that actually comes from her. The present is the past rolled up for action, and the past is the present unrolled for understanding. And I think that's what they were trying to get across in why they wrote about the story of civilization.

Not so much the story itself, although that's important, but why knowing something about civilization is important. In terms of this ideal portfolio, when we get back to self-knowledge, and I wanted to touch base on this. In other words, if Durant's quote holds any water, the present is the past rolled up for action.

Well, then it's a good idea to get into what is already there. And then the past is the present unrolled for understanding. Well, that's our job in self-knowledge.

In other words, we're trying to understand what is it that came before or is already in us that we're quite unaware of. And by the way, I just want to make a footnote here of a thought. Morphogenic fields that Sheldrake talks about is this whole thing.

This idea that the past and the resonance and the things that took place in the past, just like the butterfly being genetically knowing where to fly to mate. You know, they make that journey to Mexico and all that sort of jazz. I mean, where did that come from? Did mama butterfly tell that to them? No.

And so this is a very interesting stuff because it seems like what we can learn about how we are wired already will give us some insights into not only our purpose, but how it is that we're going to move forward, want to move forward, need to move forward, be compelled to move forward unconsciously as this system sort of runs. The ideal portfolio that I've found over a period of doing this for about 40-some years is that you should know how you learn. You want to know your strengths and talents, which are two different things, by the way.

You want to know what your inborn drives or desires are, motives, as we talked about in the recent behavioral tendencies. In other words, there's a tendency for us to behave. Because remember, most of us are unconscious.

I mean, you just can't use the spotlight of consciousness all the time. It'll burn out, burn you out, and everybody else out. So we've got to kind of make everything work unconsciously.

It's just like driving to work. Nobody thinks about how they got to work because they've done it so many times that they don't think about it. They turn here, they turn here, and they do it unconsciously.

You don't think about it. So it's basically sort of a floodlight thing rather than a spotlight. Or if somebody hits their brakes two or three cars ahead of you, you certainly get that in your spotlight and come to consciousness real quick about the driving.

But that's the idea there. Type dynamics and preferences. Most people just learn their preferences.

They don't understand the dynamics. That's really key. Attitudes and patterns about how things in all of us have a certain intensity or not.

Conflict modes, how we look at conflict. Trait and energy intensities, those are so, so, so critical. And then, of course, as Young talked about the archetypes, some people will say, including Young and many others who've studied him and people who are talking, even to a certain extent, with Sheldrake's work in biology, found that archetypes are much more

present than we realize in that most of us are behaving archetypically, I guess you would say.

It's important to note it's usually hard to include all these personality assessments due to costs and limits of study, but it's also necessary to state you can never know which of these can fill in the puzzle of personality more completely for design purposes, depending on the person. So some people say, why don't you just give one? Well, one is a snapshot. So when you're looking at an album of behavior, an album of psychology, an album of problem creation, an album of emergence, do you want to see more? You can learn most of this information through structured interviews, studying, subsequent interpretation, reflection, usually pretty high cost.

They charge a lot to do one-on-one work, so we do a lot of this work at a much lesser investment. And that's important when we look at this thing. But, you know, I just found this approach I call CAPC, Considered Appreciative Thoughtful Approach.

I defined it down in the footnotes. It's less expensive, more differentiated. So in other words, to tie this whole thing together, we're saying paradigmatically, shift from consumption to purpose.

We didn't say stop consuming. We just say do it purposefully. Okay, so that changes the whole paradigm in terms of how we approach everything.

Because we respect what our purpose is, we respect what others' purposes are, and then we begin to work at a joint level of collaboration among those purposes. There's been so many times that I've wanted to do things that I've reached out to someone to help me do them, and they really are not on purpose with that particular thing. And so I would just thank them very much and go find somebody who is, because it's going to cost me less, it's going to get done faster, it's going to be a better quality product, those kind of things.

If you know that, oh, that's on purpose for somebody, and this other thing is, yeah, they can do it, but that's not really purposeful for them. And so that's really important, especially when we talk about organizations and putting them together and cultures and things like that. Really important to find out what people are on purpose about, and therefore get them into those modes so you don't have to, you know, motivate them, quote, unquote.

Bottom line, many roads lead to Rome, but the assessment road is more efficient, effective, and sustainable, in my opinion. So in the next series of casts, I just put a short note there that we do have a set of microcasts that talk about those assessments that we're working on and will roll out when we do the rest of this R&D group. In terms of Q&A, the reason I put this question in there, how do the mechanics shift, well, you can see how they shift.

In other words, the mechanics of our whole entire system must shift significantly for us to be on purpose and for us to begin to help others find a way to engage their own path of purpose. And so the mechanics are going to have to shift, and that's going to be woven with energy and information. I mean, obviously, all of us come every day with a certain amount of energy that we have to play with, that we have to expand, that we have to invest, that we have to do whatever it is we do with.

And when that's applied with information of who, what, when, where, why, and how, then it becomes, you know, sort of a process that we can use every day. If you want to spend less energy with different kind of information, well, that's important. That's what we're talking about, and path of purpose becomes much more focused.

I just dropped this video in there. Some of you may or may not have seen it. The first three minutes is worth it.

The rest is a little bit of redundancy, but it's good to see the whole thing. I dropped this other one in there. This is from John Peterson, a guy I met in the 90s who's a futurist, was in the Navy.

I think he was a pilot, and I think he made it up to something like Assistant Secretary of Defense or something like that. Anyway, he's been a futurist for some time. I wrote a note in here about AI, the idea behind some of the things that he talks about in the thing.

It's interesting, those comments with the interview topics. The reason I put this here is if you haven't heard of some of this stuff before, this is coming from a fairly reputable person. I'm not saying I agree with everything he says, but if you want to see some counter ideas, listen to this interview.

And then, of course, at the end of the call, there's that little CAPSI definition, consider it an appreciative, positive, thoughtful, sustainable, efficient, effective. That's kind of a purpose, a little bit of a set of values, purpose in the lead you way. In other words, if it can't achieve those kinds of things, then we probably need to sort of minimize it or move away from it a little bit.

So that's important. And, of course, that's the model of generativity that we're talking about. This is much more difficult when you start trying to teach these people.

It's a lot easier to think about it and to know what it is than it is to teach it to other people who don't think about it and don't know what it is. So I'm going to continue to work on that. So we'll wind things up right there and let that all sort of sit in the soup and cook for a little while.

And then we'll come back next week and talk about a few other things that I want to talk about. And one of the things I should say is that extroversion is extremely cathartic and necessary for those of us that do not know what we think until we think about it. So extroverts, if you do not have enough venues to make sure that you're extroverting enough around your thinking and feeling to understand what it is you really think and believe, not just one or two cycles, I believe this because I believe this because I believe this, but what's below that? What are those primitive beliefs that are running us that are completely unconscious? That's where the purpose stuff lies, and you have to get down there, and you're going to have to talk about that enough.

Well, one of the reasons I raise this issue around extroverts is because we're always trying to And I tell myself all the time, don't talk so much, don't talk so much. Not only do people not want to, it's just going to make things more complex. You're just going to do this.

At the same time, when I'm doing this R&D work, it's extremely important that I hear myself because I'm hearing myself as I speak it, I'm hearing myself when I listen to it being recorded, and the best self-developmental process you can get is listen to yourself and compare that to what you were thinking or feeling when you thought you were saying it or felt you were saying it, and then watch yourself, watch your video, watch what it is that you look like when you're doing things and stuff like that. That's one of the best self-developmental mechanisms I know, and so that's an important part of this process. So yes, this process is important to not only get it out and to try to understand how it forms behind these seven skills because basically the seven skills are a flipped hierarchy.

In other words, at the very base of anything is skill, and then what you do with it through all those different levels of complexity. We're taking you to the foundational level here at these seven skills, and you want to make sure that as you learn these skills and apply them to all the teachable points of view that you run across, that you hold, that you understand about your purpose are very important. And those, according to the lead you way, should be considerate, appreciative, positive, thoughtful, sustainable, efficient, effective, and generative.

So that's how we're getting at that. I realize now, and this was a revelation for me this past week, is that constructing this model of generativity is not only a paradigmatic issue, it causes us to move beyond a lot of the paradigm that we have in place right now that we have sort of grown up over the last 10,000, 12,000 years of recorded history, things like that. So when you look at that, you go, oh, that's a pretty big issue when you start talking about that.

So you kind of go back and you want to check yourself. You want to check some things and say, hey, does this really make sense? In other words, is this set of dynamic inquiry system skills really going to help us in all these things, or are we just making something up that we do? So very important to understand all that process. I'll leave it there.

Hopefully you'll join us for another call, and we'll talk to you again. Mike Che with Leadership University.