I saw this graphic on a Facebook thread and added the graphic below, saying that “If you can imagine the problem a group of people are trying to solve as the hub of a wheel, then imagine the graphic [Yasuhiko Genku Kimura](http://tinyurl.com/Facebookthread3-15-16) has submitted as the thinking of each person represented by a spoke in this wheel. Since what we think is so little understood by others, building a shared understanding of a complex problem, and a commitment to actions that need to repeat over many years, is a huge challenge.”
This is huge challenge.

While thousands of people talk about helping kids, few are talking in the same conversation, or with a common vision, or set of goals and strategies.

Many not willing to look beyond what they are already doing, to what they should also be doing.

Everyone understands and defines problem differently.

Getting all stakeholders into same conversation, on on-going basis, also huge challenge.
I have been involved for many years with a colleague who has been using participatory democracy and deliberation to co-build a ‘meta-constitution’. This is not an easy place to provide the details, but I have tried to extract some key words that I hope you find relevant here. It is based on the premise that we are more likely to agree with unlike minded others on issues of Universal Harm - and thereby avid them in Universal Interests. It is also taking a global, big-picture perspective.

“This meta-constitution has been developed in anticipation of the need for a world constitutional forum to serve this purpose. In accord with the preceding considerations, its first entry level ticket requires an integrity-aspiring promise: a pledge of commitment to global responsibility. Invoked by the Categorical Imperative and the Golden Rule, such commitment presses us to undertake what obviously is our first and highest priority act of ethical responsibility – the autonomous working out of the particular, globally protective norms that we will commit to enact. No simple challenge. It should see us embarking on an integrity developing journey – with unlike-minded others – first to find agreement on globally protective norms that we would promise to uphold as the constitutional foundations of the world’s economic and political order. Second, the walk-the-talk journey will see us constituting and/or joining an exemplar global civic organisation based on those foundations.

These integrity requirements are embedded in the proposed draft metaconstitution. A key premise is that by aligning and rebuilding our inner constitutions (our integrities) in accord with globally protective norms that we agree upon, our constitutional relationship will not only be optimally protective, it will be legitimate. This premise steers us to the need for an education-based constitutionalism that engages children at the earliest age. To prevent indoctrination, enable all to exercise moral autonomy, and assure constitutional legitimacy, such global education needs to be governed by the kind of metaconstitutional safeguards exemplified here.

During the Facebook discussion, Neil Davidson, based in Australia, began to offer some visualizations, with his commentary, starting with this.
When I see people using visualizations in a conversation, I join in. I don’t find too many using maps and visualizations to share their thinking like this in my Chicago network.

It does not mean it’s not happening. It just means I’m not yet in the conversation.

“we are more likely to agree with unlike minded others on issues of Universal Harm - and thereby avid them in Universal Interests. It is also taking a global, big-picture perspective.”

“This premise steers us to the need for an education-based constitutionalism that engages children at the earliest age.”

When someone says “birth-to-work” this image is what I hope they are seeing in their mind.
In terms of Yasuhiko’s diagram - we need to have a means of mutual understanding, which means a mechanism for weaving ‘common’ sense out of initial diversity.

Yet we do not want to lose the diversity going forward, for that is where innovation comes from, the novelty introduced by ‘different eyes’.

Hence we have focused on co-defining/agreeing as much as we can as collective knowledge about ‘the system’ before aiming to move forward in collective agreement.

There will be different rates and comfort levels going forward, so each point of ‘mutual understanding’ is likely to be a temporary intersection according to the best-fit, common perspectives achieved during dialogues at a particular point in our agreed knowledge... yet science keeps advancing, so we might know something different tomorrow - hence the need for ‘rules of evidence’ if we are to change prior agreed proposals/directions.

One model I’ve been playing with is this one. Soon to be tested in an international research project with my community development/rural entrepreneurship colleague from the US in community engagement in 4 rural towns in Qld and NSW in the Murray-Darling Basin in Australia.
I responded with this graphic, and the message posted below

Neil Davidson: It would be interesting to see this process applied in bringing a community together to agree on a strategy, then implement it over a period of years. For instance, in most large cities there are pockets of high poverty, where youth don’t move as successfully, or safely through school and into jobs. Getting people into the community to talk to each other often enough that common understanding and agreement on solutions could be achieved would be a first challenge. Sustaining that agreement, and generating resources needed to apply the solution, in many places over many years, would be an even greater challenge. The "here to there" graphic is intended to draw attention to this.
When someone shares a process map like this.....

I responded with this graphic, and the message posted below

Here to There: Goals and Journeys

If the goal is to help kids from first grade to jobs out of poverty by mid 20s, the journey is almost 20 years for each youth.

Neil Davidson: It would be interesting to see this process applied in bringing a community together to agree on a strategy, then implement it over a period of years. For instance, in most large cities there are pockets of high poverty, where youth don't move as successfully, or safely through school and into jobs. Getting people into the community to talk to each other often enough that common understanding and agreement on solutions could be achieved would be a first challenge. Sustaining that agreement, and generating resources needed to apply the solution, in many places over many years, would be an even greater challenge. The "here to there" graphic is intended to draw attention to this.
Hi Daniel F. Bassill - I love it! Yes, I have been trying to do similar things but in slightly different areas.

One current focus is on asylum seeker policy and all those it affects in Australia (and potentially globally). This diagram shows my current ‘stakeholder ecosystem map’ - you will see that there are many players and many overlaps.

Finding alternative pathways is as easy (or hard) as identifying who is NOT already there, inviting them in, confirming with everybody that the visual is as accurate a representation of the system as mutually possible (i.e. c-constructing mutual understanding) and then joining the overlapping players through DIFFERENT pathways/ strategies/ agreements to those normally proffered as ‘business-as-usual’,... if it aint workin’ something’s gotta change.

And, once you can see new pathways new stakeholders, different value chains, AND you have fostered more common collaborative intent, THEN you could stretch those pathways out in a linear fashion (like your diagram), test the relative feasibility of each, and turn the most prospective into fundable strategies/ project plans. And, each player knows what their piece is and how they fit in mutual systems ethical benefit.
Finding alternative pathways is as easy (or hard) as identifying who is NOT already there, inviting them in,”

When I read this, I’m thinking of…

These are all network analysis and visualization tools that need to be used.
Neil added “The follow-up diagram that helps the players in the system see at a glance who else is doing what... let the system see itself”
I responded with this graphic, and “Neil Davidson Do you use concept maps with this? I start with this map then have many maps from it. http://tinyurl.com/tmc-strategy-map I’m no where close to gaining consensus, or making this a collective effort. However, It could be useful for those who do have the consensus building capacity and skills. “
When I see this, I'm thinking of…

Concept maps, animation and systems thinking tool that can turn complex graphics into pieces of understanding.
I asked Neil if he had put these visualizations into blog articles. He responded:

Hi again Daniel - I could, and know others that do, but generally haven't for a few years. I do explore these issues on a whiteboard in real time, and generally to try to show that there are many different takes on many elements in motion.

One of the big challenges (and it comes back to the original diagram) is that most people are so ingrained in the current paradigm—that largely is NOT working—that they cannot, or choose not, to see/hear what is being said at a deeper/more complex level of thinking. This is critical if we are to be able to generate alternative concept maps!

The concept maps I’ve seen generally do a pretty good job of generating a good understanding of the "symptoms", however few go (or dare go) to the structural causes. This step is often far too challenging for most (in government or funding circles) to consider/hear, and far too dangerous for most (e.g. funds receivers/grant applicants) to say!

Speaking out against this culture of silence is necessary to break the stranglehold of 'business-as-usual' assumptions that will otherwise 'do good stuff', but only 'the wrong things righter'...not 'the right things' -- such things are best said and most likely to come from a creative outsider/systems thinker (me? wink emoticon) than most present.

I find that if I practice what I call 'keynote listening', I can weave the pieces that arise from the many already in the room in real time, and show the systemic connections that others intuit but daren't speak. This often results in collective 'aha' moments as a more common mutual understanding of the systemic harms and options is revealed, quite often from the pieces they provided! The collective sigh, gasp or applause can quite often shift the social field to a more generative position.... unfortunately that moment is hard to capture in the longer term as most get sucked back into the BAU world where they are incentivised to ignore those things that do not align with 'current policy', or that pay them to ignore those that cannot pay.

I have been trying to tap into the latent demand for more transformative change with 'transformative thinkers' (i.e. not 'actor-memorisers' who play by the existing script). When this happens you get a dynamic a bit like this diagram, where the linear 'doing' comes AFTER the co-design of better alternatives that have not yet been trialled.

Thanks for your line of inquiry - I trust the length of my comments is only bothering those who are reading my long posts to differ with my experiences, not by those who switched off already -- which brings us back to the original diagram wink emoticon
“One of the big challenges (and it comes back to the original diagram) is that most people are so ingrained in the current paradigm—that largely is NOT working—that they cannot, or choose not, to see/hear what is being said at a deeper/more complex level of thinking.”

“The concept maps I’ve seen generally do a pretty good job of generating a good understanding of the “symptoms”, however few go (or dare go) to the structural causes. This step is often far too challenging for most (in government or funding circles) to consider/hear, and far too dangerous for most (e.g. funds receivers/grant applicants) to say!”

“...I find that if I practice what I call ‘keynote listening’, I can weave the pieces that arise from the many already in the room in real time, and show the systemic connections that others intuit but don’t speak. This often results in collective ‘aha’ moments as a more common mutual understanding of the systemic harms and options is revealed. One often from the pieces they provide. The collective sigh, gasp or applause can quite often put the social field to a more generative position...unfortunately that moment is hard to capture in the longer term as we don’t get sucked back into the BAI world where they are incentivized to ignore those things that do not align with current policy, or that pay them to ignore those that do not pay.”

Neil’s graphic is similar in concept to one created by Gene Bellinger. I show in this blog article: http://tutormentor.blogspot.com/2015/04/what-if-1-of-election-spending-were.html
Neil Davidson Daniel - unfortunately I don't have a blog, yet, but I keep getting asked so I probably should do something about it!

Interestingly I find it more powerful and satisfying to discuss in real-time than write about in passive third person! I have recently been pointed to Medium, and am considering including a few posts, and my experiences in these sorts of conversations, there. Watch this space smile emoticon

Like · Reply · March 15 at 8:12pm

Daniel F. Bassill Neil Davidson I like your term 'keynote listening'. I built this skill in 1970s and 1980s as a retail advertising manager for a large corporation where I would listen to marketing/advertising goals of different sales departments and executives then co...See More

Like · Reply · March 15 at 8:15pm

Neil Davidson Gatecrash!! I do!

Unfortunately the immune system of the current system is so strong that if I raise my hand to ask a question/ make an integrative comment -- e.g. after a University 'Public Lecture' -- I am sometimes introduced in disparaging terms by the moderator/ chair!

This brings us back to the original diagram - those that 'don't get it' boundary-ride on their knowledge...

This is a brief extract from a report I wrote last year:

In “The Australian Natural Resource Management Knowledge System” Prof Val Brown describes five types of knowledge, and the ‘boundary riding’ and ‘ascribing of ignorance’ that goes on as they compete for primacy.

These five knowledges are:

- Individual Knowledge – own lived experience/ lifestyle choices/ learning style/ identity [identity, reflections, ideals]

- Local Community Knowledge – shared lived experience of individuals, families, businesses, communities [stories, events, histories]

- Specialised Knowledge – Environment & health science, finance, engineering, law, philosophy etc [case studies, experiments]

- Organisational Knowledge – Org governance, policy development, legislation, market [agendas, allegiances, planning]

- Holistic Knowledge – core of the matter, vision of the future, a common purpose, aim of sustainability [symbol, vision, ideal]

In Blessed Unrest (2007, p20) Paul Hawken says “The world seems to be looking for the big solution, which is itself part of the problem, since the most effective solutions are both local and systemic.”

What is required is, as Val Brown suggests, is

- Collective Knowledge – all the decision-making knowledges generate a synergy [individuals, local community, specialised interests, influential organisations, & holistic enquiries]”

I find that those that are open-minded/ open-hearted/ open-willed and DO get it quite often gather around 'me' after the lecture! I find the proportion of those capable and mature enough to approach me afterwards is running at about 4% of those present wink emoticon

Unlike · Reply · March 15 at 8:29pm · Edited

NEIL DAVIDSON  http://tinyurl.com/Facebookthread3-15-16

Like · Reply · March 15 at 8:12pm
I'll post one more diagram, and then leave it at that.

One on one we can pretend we have reached mutual understanding, all you have to do is agree with the other in a convincing enough way... so the responses above about heart are important - we must have common intent.

For group situations I have found this diagram useful in allowing multiple individuals to self-differentiate according to where they think they can bring something to the discourse. Once they have done this, recognised their differences, then I have seen much faster building of cohesion, with mutual respect for ‘the other’ intelligences present. Until then it is often conflicting/competing perspectives seeking ascendance.... let the system see itself and emergence can happen through individual and mutual feedback, in systems context.

Daniel F. Bassill Neil Davidson Back in 1990s I was introduced to a group facilitation program where each participant was on a PC so ideas could be generated quickly, then sorted into buckets based on commonality. Then votes could be taken that quickly would show agreement or disagreement, or something in between. Knowing that there’s agreement, the group could move forward. Knowing the opposite, or something in between, led the facilitator to dig deeper looking for common ground. This was called Group Systems, by a company called Ventana. Are you, or any one else, aware of such a tool being used in on-line conversations?

After Patton: Developmental Evaluation: Applying Complexity Concepts to Enhance Innovation and Use June 2010
Unfortunately, I've never found the resources to apply group facilitation consistently, or effectively.

Once they have done this, recognized their differences, then I have seen much faster building of cohesion, with mutual respect for 'the other' intelligences present.

Daniel F. Bassill, Neil Davidson. Back in 1990s I was introduced to a group facilitation program where each participant was on a PC so ideas could be generated quickly, then sorted into buckets based on commonality. Then votes could be taken that quickly would show agreement or disagreement, or something in between. Knowing that there's agreement, the group could move forward. Knowing the opposite, or something in between, led the facilitator to dig deeper looking for common ground. This was called Group Systems, by a company called Ventana. Are you, or any one else, aware of such a tool being used in on-line conversations?

I'll post one more diagram, and then leave it at that.

One on one we can pretend we have reached mutual understanding, all you have to do is agree with the other in a convincing enough way... so the responses above about heart are important - we must have common intent.

For group situations I have found this diagram useful in allowing multiple individuals to self-differentiate according to where they think they can bring something to the discourse. Once they have done this, recognised their differences, then I have seen much faster building of cohesion, with mutual respect for 'the other' intelligences present. Until then it is often conflicting/competing perspectives seeking ascendance... let the system see itself and emergence can happen through individual and mutual feedback, in systems context.

Connect with Dan Bassill on Facebook, LinkedIn or Twitter and join in on these idea sharing conversations. If you have a better on-line space to connect, invite me in.
I wonder whether Michelle Holliday's diagram (with my additional loop and feedbacks) might be worth considering here as well?

As I understand it, this diagram was (about 4 weeks ago?) a work-in-progress draft provided for group refinement.... toward mutual understanding 😊

August Mohr I'd like to share this. Is it on a page of it's own or a site somewhere?
March 15 at 9:04pm · Like · 1

Neil Davidson Hi August Mohr - as far as I'm aware the original diagram came from Michelle Holliday. I added the extra/outer ellipse. Michelle has seen and 'liked' my addition, but I'm not sure where it 'resides'. Michelle?
March 15 at 9:06pm · Like

John Kellden Those are good questions.

Is the space inside which we are conversing around these questions, generative enough - conducive to convivial inquiry, perhaps even conversations that mind and matter, perhaps even metalogue - a meaning-moving-with?
March 16 at 4:01am · Like

Michelle Holliday Neil Davidson could you send me your revised version in a format I can easily add to? I'd like to add reference to "when." Wondering how to share it in an open source way. Any suggestions?
March 16 at 6:39am · Like · 2

Neil Davidson I used your picture, dropped it into PowerPoint, and then turned it back to a pic.
March 16 at 6:50am · Like · 1
Following the public conversation, I started chat with Neil, saying “Enjoyed meeting you in the recent conversation. Did not mean to monopolize. In response to your last conversation I feel that every major city in the world has pockets of isolated poverty and some people concerned about this to the point that they are looking around the world for ideas. I host my ideas on http://www.tutormentorexchange.net web site, along with ideas of others. I use social media and my blogs to cast a net on a daily basis with the goal of catching the attention of others who are concerned about the issues and willing to look beyond what they are already doing to what they might do. Such a group, if connected in facilitated space, could have a powerful impact.”

During that chat I shared some other links and said, “You might be interested in some of the ideas about network analysis and GIS mapping that I share at http://www.tutormentorexchange.net/sna

Later he posted this graphic saying

“I wonder, have you ever considered the ‘vertical’ differentiation of networks, separated according to different worldviews - which of course affects how anyone ‘sees’ the same landscape through different eyes? “

He responded, and said,

Hi Daniel - thanks for your interest and for your sharing - no monopoly experienced! I have said often that the conversation between two players on social media is taking place in front of an unknown number of potentially interested others, some of whom will find themselves ‘strangely attracted’ to connect. This is similar to your ‘net-casting’. I look forward to following up on your links. The most recent work I did, and the report from which I quoted, was with the UN Regional Centre of Expertise--Murray-Darling, which is about Education for Sustainability across some of the areas that would be covered by Australia’s school of the air/ distance ed.”
Following the public conversation, I started chat with Neil, saying “Enjoyed meeting you in the recent conversation. Did not mean to monopolize. In response to your last conversation I feel that every major city in the world has pockets of isolated poverty and some people concerned about this to the point that they are looking around the world for ideas. I host my ideas on http://www.tutormentorexchange.net website, along with ideas of others. I use social media and my blogs to cast a net on a daily basis with the goal of catching the attention of others who are concerned about the issues and willing to look beyond what they are already doing to what they might do. Such a group, if connected in facilitated space, could have a powerful impact.”

During that chat I shared some other links and said, “You might be interested in some of the ideas about network analysis and GIS mapping that I share at http://www.tutormentorexchange.net/sna

Later he posted this graphic saying

“I wonder, have you ever considered the 'vertical' differentiation of networks, separated according to different worldviews – which of course affects how anyone ‘sees’ the same landscape through different eyes?”

These two graphics illustrate long term commitment to creating a differentiation between types of tutor/mentor programs, as well as the knowledge we need to collect and share.

http://www.tutormentorprogramlocator.net/Prgloc.aspx
These are two concept maps that show multiple places to connect and expand this conversation. Join me. Bring others.

Tutor/Mentor Connection
Tutor/Mentor Institute, LLC
Merchandise Mart PO Box 3303, Chicago, Il 60654
http://www.tutormentorexchange.net
tutormentor2@earthlink.net

http://tinyurl.com/TM-BlogNet-Map

http://tinyurl.com/TMC-DanNetwork