

Note: These are excerpts from the recordings of these sessions. I have selected those statements that strongly suggest to me that the kind of research we have been doing plus the new brain stuff are extremely relevant. (2500 words)

Notes from the Leadership Interviews with

W.Brian Arthur, Jonathan Day, Joseph Jaworski, Michael Jung, Ikujiro Nonaka, C. Otto Scharmer, Peter Senge

The New Leadership Challenge is to Sense and Actualize Emerging Opportunities

In this new environment, real power comes from recognizing the patterns of change...

For Leaders, what is "Real" Has Changed

...mental-social and generative processes were considered peripheral "complications" in a value chain largely based on the primacy of the physical world.

Today, "value constellations" are largely based on intangible resources and the primacy of web-shaped patterns of relationships.

While soft variables such as intentions, interpretations and relationships are increasingly considered. In order to do well, we will have to learn to pay attention to a different set of variables: the variables that used to refer to as "soft", such as intentions, interpretations, and identity.

Operational Excellence Requires Accounting for Complexity and Evolution

...the vitality of systems is on the border between chaos and order. Chaos is very near. Its nearness but its avoidance is what gives force

The Quality of Awareness Determines Performance

...this time, the focus is redirected from the tangible to the intangible variable of social reality formation...variables like the qualities of attention and experience...these variables are personal and within oneself.

...interest in the nature of experience and how the quality of consciousness determines the quality of performance and experience, both individually and collectively

... a radical re-understanding of perception is necessary.

...the challenge for leaders is to develop the "knowledge for action"...by becoming more mindful of the deep sources from which behavior and profound innovation and change emanate.

Experience Must Inform "Strategy and Leadership

...an important blind spot...lies in not seeing the full process of social reality formation.

The issue of developing a sound method for accessing experience will be of utmost importance for leadership and strategy development.

Social and Managerial Realities Arise from the Same Deep Source

Three different levels of emergence: 1. The behavioral level of social reality; 2. The level of emerging patterns of relationships; and 3. The deep tacit level, or “source”—what we call the blind spot—the place from which a system operates

...that would give us better access to the tacit dimension of distributed leadership lies in the emerging new patterns of business environments.

The Self is the Eye of the Needle

Today, everyday leadership practices focus primarily on what is visible. The relevance of mapping the *in* visible territory of leadership—the tacit territory—is to develop a deeper level of knowing, a deeper level of awareness

Knowledge Creation and Innovation Happen in Places

Knowledge creation always depends on situated perception, cognition, and action—on a *ba*, the Japanese word for “place” [we think of this as field or container]. The quality of *ba* determines the quality of knowledge creation...it arises from interactions, from patterns of relationship that evolve among participants.

There is a big difference between what people physically do in a company and the kind of mental space they’re in, which relates to whether they are feeling like they’re part of the corporate story.

Primary Knowing: Shifting the Place from Where We Operate

Primary knowing...is based on the fact that mind and world are not separate but are aspects of the same underlying field.

Organizations are Relational Spheres in Motion

Organizational Health Stems from the Interplay of Three Relational Spheres

...the vitality and interplay of three contexts: the formal/structural, the social/relational, and the trans-personal [by trans-personal I assume he speaks of the field or climate that is the result of the other two]

A good and healthy organization is natural in that all people, as W.E. Deming said, “Seek joy in work.”

Leadership is Both Deeply Personal and Inherently Collective

...leadership in this world may be defined as shaping “life-enhancing conditions”.

The most Important Tool for Leading 21st Century Change Is the Leader’s Self

Distributed Leadership Systems Require Collective Practices

...the journey of cultivation has always focused on three core elements: study, practice, and service. Study means *to see reality*—sense what is going on here in the here and now. Practice means *to meditate on reality*—to take conversations and collective processes to a deeper level, to the point of stillness, “where knowing comes to the surface”. To serve means *to collectively co-create reality*, to bring forth new worlds that serve new possibilities for living.

Organizations Must Develop Core Practices That Inspire Creativity and Action

It is likely that over the next couple of decades another method will emerge to replace Total Quality Management and Systems Management.

[We could call it Field-Based Management!]

Must focus on creating three spaces that allow people and project teams to move from co-sensing (space 1) to co-conspiring (space 2) and to co-creating the new (space 3) in order to unleash and sustain large-scale innovation and change

Illuminating the Blind Spot:

Leadership in the Context of Emerging Worlds

Peter Senge

The capacity to sustain change that brings forth new realities in line with people’s genuine aspirations.

Wieck’s theory of enactment says that social structures are continually being created through people’s daily actions. Humans are continually creating structures—patterns of interdependency—whether they are aware of it or not.

...this emphasis on individual cultivation the idea that importance of a shared context or *ba*.

There is no collective cultivation without individual cultivation.

...evocation of fields suggests that aspects of generative *ba* are energetic, akin to quantum or electromagnetic fields that create causality at a distance.

- turning toward a more authentic source of experience
- observes the unfolding of the implicate into the explicate (Bohm)
- generative shared fields arise out of authentic actions informed by a larger flow of meaning.
- acting out of such a state of being not only connects people to nature's unfolding but to one another

The territory of leadership in the service of bringing forth new realities requires capabilities that attend to all four levels. Such leadership is rare. This will remain the case so long as cultivation of people's capacities to attend to all levels remains neglected.

I believe that practical realities will compel more and more organizations to learn what it takes to create a climate that encourages cultivation and continual deep learning, especially for those who rise to positions of authority.

It will also require attending in more subtle ways to the overall environment or context [or field] within which work occurs.

People know when they are in a "generative space". They sense the excitement, trust, and openness to new ideas combined with commitment to results. I believe that organizations that will thrive in the current economic reality will increasingly learn how to collectively cultivate the capacity to create such spaces.

**Presencing:
Illuminating the Blind Spot of Leadership
Claus Otto Scharmer**

There is a blind spot: usually we are unable to answer the question "Where does our action come from?" The blind spot concerns the (inner) *source* from which we operate when we do what we do.

Organizations, institutions, and societies as a whole have this blind spot—not only individuals. ...what really sets successful organization and societies apart has to do with that dimension: the inner place from which a person, an organization, or system operates.

The Archeology of Social Fields

(his farmer father)

Each field, he explained to me, has two aspects: the visible, which is what we see above the surface; and the invisible, which is what we find below the surface. The

quality of the yield—the visible result—is a function of the quality of the soil, of those elements of the field that are invisible to the eye.

...fields are the *grounding condition*, the living soil from which grows that which *later only* becomes visible to the eye. ...every good organizational leader focuses all her attention of sustaining and enhancing the quality of the social field that she is responsible for.

The issue in working with social fields is that we haven't yet learned how to see below the surface, how to decipher the subtle structures and principles of the territory underneath...it is this invisible territory that is the most important when it comes to creating the conditions for high performance in teams, organizations, and larger ecologies.

What is most important is invisible to the eye.

The purpose of the field walk is to learn to see what so far has largely remained invisible> the full process of *coming-into-being* of social reality.

I found that the attention of the actor, or group, or organization is exactly the blind spot that corresponds to the invisible quality of the field underneath the surface. The term 'field structure of attention' allows me to get my arms around it.

Most leaders do not intend to repeat the patterns and mistakes of the past. What is missing is the social leadership technology that would allow them to shift from learning from the past to learn from presencing emerging futures.

Forming and Sculpting Mental-Emotional Fields **Michael Jung**

Group performance, both in an economic and in an organizational sense, can be defined as a function of the quality of direction and quality of interaction in the group

...every practical problem ...is nothing other than a very specific configuration of these underlying questions

Tom Melohn says that a 40% commitment is sufficient to get by in a typical company without attracting attention

But it is more likely that the company with its roles and processes has failed to reach the souls of its people, and so congruence between personal identity projects and the course of corporate development does not arise to any great degree

In reality we are seeking causal relations in segments of reality that simply do not appear *within* such segments. They appear only when one considers the whole.

The more we shift our attention from palpable, concrete, visible things to intangible ones—to individual and collective intellectual phenomena,—the dimmer the prospects become for making headway...

The underlying phenomena are much too complex, and in many cases, not tangible enough to achieve that.

...Our insufficient understanding of the human condition seriously impedes our progress.

We know from experience that we cannot simply produce an idea on command when we need it. It seems we need to take a sort of detour into the semi-conscious or unconscious mind, and we really have very little grasp of what is going on there. There fore we are in not position to effectively manage our creativity, or our creative process.

[I beg to differ!!]

In dialogue and group interaction we have a vehicle, which can mobilize latent knowledge far more effectively than a monologue with oneself ever could.

Imagine an organization that could really exploit the power of creative dialogue! I think we currently tap no more than 10%—20% of the potential here.

We have only limited ability to look into our own heads and hearts.

The practical conclusion is that there would be a lot of value is making “internal organizational architecture” the inner biases that are at work in individuals and, aggregated in groups—visible to a much higher degree

We fail to recognize the essence of economic success, which can best be described as the forming or “sculpting” of mental and emotional fields.

We must gradually learn to define the optimal layout of the contents and patterns of interaction.

We have not paid enough attention to creating the second workbench...to strengthening mental and emotional fields

The cognitive and emotional sphere is the real “workbench”

...there is a production process for high-quality mental and social contexts...

...it is not only useful but critically important to spend time on developing this asset of mental and social contexts

I think there need not be a trade-off between personal happiness and meaning on the one hand and economic performance on the other. Quite the opposite, in fact.

...it would become clear that leadership is not the product of a single person alone, but also of the relations between persons.

Organizations: What are they?

...a shift from thinking of knowledge and leadership as attributes of individuals to conceiving of it primarily as a system function of the relationships between individuals.

The Tacit Dimension of Client Relationships

...I feel obligations that determine how well formed, how close to reality, how productive is this thought world.

...we are probably at the very beginning of the design or development of a technology which will give us comparable access to thought processes.

....a production program in the intellectual realm can be influenced correspondingly through mental assets. But we do not know how to build up these mental assets

The essence of high-performance systems and economic success is, according to Jung, deeply related to the "forming and sculpting of mental and emotional fields"

Three Gestures of Becoming Aware

Varela

We haven't found a good method of accessing the situated and living nature of organizational experience.

It's as if there's a blind spot. In the domain of consciousness studies, this notion implies a going back to work with experience, the importance of taking *seriously* first-person experience.

On the Core Process of Becoming Aware

Yes, you have to distinguish between the purely first-person point of view and the interface between the first and second person, the third person being the objective point of view. This is the view from nowhere

We are social individuals, this is true if, and only if, we take into account what's happening in the context of the other. That's where the second person position comes in.

The more we get close to all our reality, the more we are who we are. Not just me, but the “us-ness” in us. Which is another way of saying that my mind is not my mind. It is a mind that requires interbeing.

Grabbing the Tiger by the Tail **Robert Kegan**

In fact, the way we create knowledge in silos of different departments and disciplines and, how little, even within a given department, people actually communicate with each other in any meaningful way is a problem...

We have not learned how to collaborate in deep ways that would actually take advantage of the differing kinds of gifts and capacities that people have...

My theory is a kind of attending to—reverencing and nurturing—the mysterious life-giving, negentropic processes in the universe

...more organizational thinkers don't think deeply enough about the individuals in an organization. To become a learning organization, you've got to have sophisticated notions about the individual learners in that organization.

Now, what I think is very interesting is the way in which leadership increasingly is about leadership for processes of change...you're almost always leading for change

Inhibiting Forces

The biggest sources of inhibition are usually deep running commitments to what we experience as self-protection. Or we experience them as a protection against disaster, which is only the upheaval of the equilibrium that we've identified in ourselves.

Individuals have these inner contradictions and continuously manufacture non-change. We are especially interested in helping people develop new relations between themselves and these dynamics

The Source That Stays in Need of Us

Self theory: our internal and behavioral responses are not just moment-to-moment responses to stimuli, but that there is something like a central organizing tendency—the meaning-interpretive dimension of human personality...it is consistent.

Is meaning-making coming from each of us individuals or is there some way in which it is drawing on the life force itself?