The Math Movement | Practices for Interacting with Staff

The Math Movement's goal is to create a new world where we think clearly and support each other. We talk about creating something new because so much of our history is based on pushing each other down, and our goal is to lift each other up.

How we see ourselves dictates the types of institutions we create and the ways we interact with each other. Seeing ourselves as free and equal by nature leads us to create liberal institutions promoting individual liberty and equality before the law. Other ways of seeing ourselves can lead to authoritarian regimes based on monarchy and heredity, dictatorship, fascism, or communism.

In The Math Movement we see ourselves as unique expressions of a common effort. The idea that this effort - life - goes beyond any of us as individuals can be seen many ways. One can realize that our descendants will only share $1/2^n$ of our genes within n generations (at some point possibly 0 genes); one can take the long view and think about what will remain after the passage of time (as eloquently expressed by poets like Shelley and Neruda); one can have a mind-bending experience pointing to a larger consciousness beyond individual boundaries (Pollan (2018)); one can take a small step back in space to see the earth as a pale blue dot; one can appeal to faith; or one can just appreciate the role of chance in it all, seeing every life as a different roll of the dice or shuffle of the deck. However we most clearly see our connections to each other, those connections make individual interests melt away into the idea that, "We're all here to do what we're all here to do."

This view of our commonality, however, does not imply that the personal life is dead! While we view ourselves as being a part of a common effort, we also view ourselves as being unique individuals. This creates a vision of community in which we delight in and enjoy expressions of individuality. We believe everyone has a contribution to life, a unique way of shaping the world with love. This vision leads to a beautiful balance between the individual and the communal, which could be seen as the great debate of the last century.

Seeing ourselves as being part of the same effort leads us to see beauty in people supporting each other. This worldview also leads us to be a part of the movement to create a world based on the power of love. The Math Movement's part in this movement becomes clear if we contrast two types of power, recalling that power is "the capacity to direct or influence the behavior of others or the course of events." The power of status and fear is motivated by the desire to exert control over others for one's "own" interests. This power persuades people into action through the reasoning "I am your superior so do what I say," which is often backed up by "Do what I say or I will hurt you." Such reasoning is enabled whenever society grants higher status to some individuals than others, whether determined by wealth, title, gender, race, or nationality. This power reduces our ability to be empathetic towards others, uprooting the very basis of community.

The power of love is based in seeing the interests of all others as our own "self interest," which

Written by Dionissi Aliprantis.
This document is constantly evolving. This version is from May 13, 2022, and the most recent version is here.
The opinions expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily represent views of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland or the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

inevitably leads to building community. Contrary to the power of status and fear, the power of love elicits compassion - the ability to feel and act upon the needs of others. It is not reserved for those with "status" and is often better understood by those least valued in society. Living in a society based on the power of status and fear, and trained to think in those terms, we often miss just how powerful love can be. Appendix A elaborates on these different types of power.

`The Math Movement`'s programs are exercises in cultivating the power of love in our kids and in ourselves. We aim to convert the power of love into a form that people can understand and experience. Incredibly, our techniques for solving mathematical problems do just that. The methods of near-peer mentoring we use to learn math are so effective at building community that they also help us recognize new approaches to interacting with each other.

1 Staff Dialogues

1.1 Overview

A central goal of `The Math Movement` is for us to interact better with each other. One major way senior staff will interact with each other is in making decisions about governance. These types of decisions have to be made – how the camp responds when students or TAs do not live up to our high expectations of them. In some situations these decisions will be clear. As examples, we might ask a TA to stay home for a day of reflection if they have not fulfilled their job description or followed the TA code of conduct (modeling the ideals at all times, attending meetings, courses, etc.). Similarly, we might dismiss a student for the summer if they have engaged in violence. In many situations, though, it can be very difficult to judge where the lines are and how to best react to a situation. We believe that the best approach to reasoning about our decisions is through dialogue, interacting with each other to present and consider alternative arguments (Mercier and Sperber (2017)).

Since our camp is built on modeling behavior, the decision making process of senior staff sets the tone for interactions throughout the entire camp. In `The Math Movement` the way we arrive at a collective decision is as important as the choice itself. This approach is an expression of Gandhi's view that "means and ends are convertible terms in my philosophy of life" (Gandhi (1962)). As an illustration, consider Gandhi's argument to demonstrate that the means define the end:

> If I want to deprive you of your watch, I shall certainly have to fight for it; if I want to buy your watch, I shall have to pay for it; and if I want a gift, I shall have to plead for it; and, according to the means I employ, the watch is stolen property, my own property, or a donation.
>
> –Gandhi (1909), p 28

What, then, is the process by which we arrive at collective decisions? Our decision making process always starts with the following two questions:

- What is best for the kid?

- What is best for the camp?

These typically end up being the same question, and can often be rephrased as "What choice will be most effective at communicating with or educating our kids?"

In `The Math Movement` senior staff engage in collective decision making in a way that would be best described either as a dialogue or as a collective meditation session. Meditation is a powerful practice because it generates thinking that "is more focused and powerful than normal thought. We don't have a constant stream of thoughts running through the mind, but instead we take a thought and allow it to be there, not going anywhere but simply sitting in the mind, surrounded by awareness, and we notice what responses it calls forth" (Bodhipaksa (2007)). A staff dialogue is a group of people taking thoughts one at a time in the same way that meditation is an individual engaging in this practice.

One way of thinking about staff dialogues is asking: Why are we speaking with one another? What is the goal? So that one person can "get their way" after we collectively judge their perspective as being "right"? Or are we speaking so that we can reflect on all of the relevant considerations for the issues at hand and make a good decision for the kids involved and the camp as a whole?

These questions help to illustrate why it is so important that we treat thoughts coming from other staff members as if they originated in our own minds. This perspective will push our conversations toward dialogue: To see, as much as possible, where others' concerns come from and lead to. As described in the Platonic dialogue *Gorgias*, this is the type of discussion that is the hallmark of philosophers, and contrasts with the monologues that are the hallmark of orators and sophists:

> It may be helpful to see how the contrast between the way of life of the orator-politician and that of the philosopher is drawn in the dialogue. An external difference between them is their mode of speaking, and Plato makes this difference apparent almost immediately in the dialogue. The orator has a penchant for long, uninterrupted, stylistically polished speeches; the philosopher has no patience for the 'long style of speech,' insisting instead on 'discussion,' a dialogue in which the participants join together to seek the truth by critically examining one another's views (e.g., 449b-c). As Plato draws the contrast, this external difference is symptomatic of a much more fundamental difference in aims, values, and methods.
>
> –Donald J. Zeyl's Introduction in Plato (1987), pp ix-x

1.2 Practices for Generating Dialogues

When engaging in collective decision making the practices in our minds should be driven by the intention of having a dialogue. We also have several practices in our interactions aimed at fostering dialogues:

Practice 1) We rotate the director running staff dialogues.

We want to live in a world where people are treated fairly just because they are people, not

because of their nationality, age, race, gender, etc. We want to live by Malcolm X's maxim, "I'm for truth, no matter who tells it. I'm for justice, no matter who it's for or against. I'm a human being first and foremost, and as such I am for whoever and whatever benefits humanity as a whole" (X (1987)). In this kind of a world it would not matter if a Turkish person were the Prime Minister of Greece, or if a Mexican person were the President of the United States. In this world any leader sees themselves as a citizen of the world, and thus sees their responsibilities as lifting up everyone they govern.

The ideal governance of staff dialogues is no different than this ideal form of governance just described, and we see our collective decision making as small exercises in moving the world in this direction. While the specific individual leading a dialogue will shape the conversation through their personality, the specific person running the show on a given day will not influence who gets to speak or how the dialogue is organized. To facilitate this goal, each week we rotate the director who runs dialogues. This means not only that different people will facilitate the discussions that lead to collective decisions, but also that different people will have the ultimate responsibility for the final decision made by the group.

One drawback of this practice is that it might feel to outsiders like no one is in charge. But someone actually is "in charge" in the sense of having final responsibility for group decisions. It's just that this individual changes all the time. More importantly, this practice makes it clear that we are all responsible for what we create, and encourages empathy. Those who do not have the ultimate decision in a given week will appreciate the weight this can place on one's shoulders when they are in the same position during the next week. On the other hand, those with the power to ignore others' concerns or insights will be less inclined to do so with the knowledge that they will soon be without this power. Logistically speaking, this practice serves to incapacitate abuses of power, while at the same time providing space for examples to emerge of the right type of governance. With the right practices in our minds and interactions, rotating dialogue leadership should lead to a convergence in the substance of dialogues under all leaders.

Practice 2) We aim for equal speaking time for all during dialogues.

What makes for effective teams with collective intelligence greater than any one individual's? Research has shown that there are many ways teams can be organized to improve collective intelligence, but that the one essential ingredient is psychological safety (Woolley et al. (2010)). Psychological safety is "a sense of confidence that the team will not embarrass, reject or punish someone for speaking up. It describes a team climate characterized by interpersonal trust and mutual respect in which people are comfortable being themselves" (Edmondson (1999)).

The first key to establishing a psychologically safe team climate is by making sure that everyone speaks roughly the same amount. This might be a surprising goal. It was a surprising research finding when Google was trying to figure out how to manage teams. Google is likely to be the best organization for finding patterns in the history of humanity. Yet when they examined effective teams, they had a difficult time finding any consistent patterns. They did find one characteristic

of effective teams, though. Google found that "As long as everyone had a chance to talk, the team did well. But if only one person or a small group spoke all the time, the collective intelligence declined" (Anita Woolley in Duhigg (2016)).

The second key is that we aim to always be sensitive to someone feeling upset or left out. In addition to looking for these feelings, we are proactive in the sense of being emotionally open with each other. Sometimes just opening up about our own emotions will help people feel safe to express their own concerns; this was one of Google's experience with psychological safety. "We must know that we can be free enough, sometimes, to share things that scare us without fear of recriminations. We must be able to talk about what is messy or sad, to have hard conversations with colleagues who are driving us crazy" (Duhigg (2016)). As usual in `The Math Movement`, establishing the right culture will begin with the example set by our staff.

Practice 3) <u>We aim for dialogues to act as evidence-based rather than verdict-based juries.</u>

Human beings seem have an aversion to ambiguity – probably because decision making is more complicated when a situation is not certain. When Lyndon Baynes Johnson was given a range of possibilities by one of his advisors, he gave the famous response that "Ranges are for cattle. Give me a number" (Manski (2013)). This approach is not limited to politicians, but can even be found in research and official statistics. Despite the fact that the field deals with counterfactuals that are rarely observed, in the field of economics one finds that "Exact predictions of policy outcomes and estimates of the state of the economy are routine; expressions of uncertainty are rare" (Manski (2016)).

Small groups are susceptible to the "need" for certainty, and in our group deliberations we must be careful not to fall into this habit of the mind. One way to guide our thinking on the issue is to think about juries. We can ask ourselves, "Are we starting with a conclusion in this situation and just fitting information into that conclusion? Or are we truly considering all of the relevant evidence?"

> Social scientists who study juries often differentiate between two approaches juries take. Evidence-based juries usually don't even take a vote until after they've spent some time talking over the case, sifting through the evidence, and explicitly contemplating alternative explanations. Verdict-based juries, by contrast, see their mission as reaching a decision as quickly and decisively as possible. They take a vote before any discussion, and the debate after that tends to concentrate on getting those who don't agree to agree.
>
> ... One of the real dangers that small groups face is emphasizing consensus over dissent... small groups can exacerbate our tendency to prefer the illusion of certainty to the reality of doubt.
>
> –Surowiecki (2005), pp 178-180

We must accept before entering any dialogues that our discussions may be long and drawn out. This commitment is necessary if we are going to make good decisions. In some ways we might think

of long discussions as practice. In an apocryphal interview with Larry Bird, a journalist asked Bird why he felt entitled to take the last shot in a game. His response was something along the lines of "I take thousands of practice shots every day to earn the right to take the last shot in a game." As a group we are also taking the last shot that will decide a game and possibly a season; we are making decisions about how to interact with kids in ways that can affect their life trajectories. Knowing that we will miss on occasion, we have to earn the right to these interactions by doing everything possible to make sure we get it right. One way we do so is by a commitment to open discussions where we examine our decisions from every relevant perspective.

2 Collective Decision Making under Disagreement

2.1 Overview

Disagreements may persist even after long and healthy dialogues. In fact, disagreements between senior staff are to be expected, and will be constructive when dialogues are structured around the goal of thinking clearly about what is best for our kids in a given situation. We enter into dialogues knowing that senior staff will have disagreements and that we will not always get our way, but remembering even more importantly that imposing our way is not the goal. Disagreements are opportunities for learning about someone else's experiences, rather than opportunities to prove that one is right. We approach dialogues as a part of the much broader goal for human beings to interact better with each other.

Knowing that dialogues will not always resolve disagreements, suppose that we arrive at the following situation: There is a collective decision about governance that needs to be made – we need to call a kid and their parents tonight. We have spent 5 hours in dialogue about the different possible courses of action and the consequences of each choice. We are in disagreement about the best course of action. What do we do? As Leo Tolstoy writes in *The Kingdom of God is Within You*, the book that inspired Gandhi to develop his philosophy:

> The question amounts to this: In what way are we to decide people's disputes, when some people consider bad what others consider good, and *vice versa*? And to reply that that is good which I think good, in spite of the fact that my opponent thinks it bad, is not a solution of the difficulty. There can only be two solutions: either to find a real unquestionable criterion of what is good or to not resist bad by force.
>
> The first course has been tried ever since the beginning of historical times, and, as we all know, it has not hitherto led to any successful results.
>
> The second solution – to not forcibly resist what we consider bad until we have found a universal criterion – that is the solution given by Christ.
>
> ... we cannot treat the question as the learned critics of Christianity do. They pretend either that no such question exists at all or that the question is solved by granting to certain persons or assemblies of persons the right to define bad and to resist it by force.

> But we know all the while that granting such a right to certain persons does not decide the question (still less so when we are ourselves the certain persons), since there are always people who do not recognize this right in the authorized persons or assemblies.
>
> But this assumption, that what seems good to us really is good, shows a complete misunderstanding of the question...
>
> –Tolstoy (1984), pp 46-47

2.2 Practices for Making Decisions under Disagreement

We make decisions under disagreement using a combination of Tolstoy's two solutions. We agree, ahead of time, to a code of conduct that serves as our criterion of what is good. And we do not resist by "force" when we disagree with a group decision about what is good in a situation. For this type of respectful disagreement to be possible requires a type of discretion when exercising power that we describe below.

Practice 1) We agree to a code of conduct that serves as our criterion of what is good.

While we do not have "a real unquestionable criterion of what is good," we can all agree to some written laws that serve, at least in the context of camp, as the criterion for what is good. This set of principles for our behavior towards each other can lead to the community sanctioning people judged to have violated those principles. It is important to note here that sanctions are never given out to punish people, but rather as a means of communicating what our standards of behavior are, and are always given with love and support for making better choices in the future.

Our written laws, in the form of the student, TA, CI, and senior staff codes of conduct, start out very short and grow in length as the seniority of a position increases. For example, the student code of conduct is simple:

1. I will stay safe and never engage in violence.
2. I will strive to bring out the best in myself, both academically and socially.

Why is the student code of conduct so vague, when clarity about all rules and consequences ahead of time (*ex ante*) would obviate the need for complicated issues of governance and struggles with group decisions? For example, we could write a simple, clear-cut rule like "a student is asked to leave camp if he or she does not complete 3 homework assignments." The problem is that such a rule would inevitably be too coarse to capture the subtle ways in which membership in the event "a student should be asked to leave camp for the summer" is defined. Is the student facing difficulties at home, in which case we should grant her leniency? Or is the student facing no obstacles besides summoning her willpower, in which case we might want to ask her to leave camp after not completing 2 homework assignments?

We should not find this problem surprising, as "undescribability" is a widespread phenomenon:

> … we seldom observe exhaustive *ex ante* rules, even though formulating such rules carries potentially enormous benefits.
>
> Consider the following familiar example. Academic institutions routinely decide whether to grant tenure to junior faculty members. An *ex ante* contingent tenure rule would spell out in advance a detailed set of conditions under which tenure would be granted as a function of a candidate's performance. Formulating such a rule would entail considerable gains, such as reducing uncertainty, cutting down on the effort and resources spent in committee work and reducing the potential for allegations of inequity, bias, etc. Despite this, to our knowledge no research-oriented department in the U.S. has set forth such a rule. Instead, decisions are usually made using a lengthy case-by-case process that often suffers from the drawbacks mentioned above… complete contingent contracting on something like the tenure decision is difficult because the underlying event, 'the candidate has a tenurable vita', is inherently hard to describe *ex ante* in its full details.
>
> –Al-Najjar et al. (2006), pp 849-850

Additional examples abound: While we might all agree that no one should have the right to murder anyone else, a particular case might be exceptional. Did the situation arise from someone acting in self-defense? In international law we have the norm since the Treaty of Westphalia that one country should not invade another. Should this rule have an exception if there is a genocide occurring inside one country (Power (2000))? Should historical connections supercede this ideal in the case of Putin invading Crimea or Mussolini invading Greece? Did self-defense justify George W. Bush's invasion of Iraq? Staff dialogues must decide these types of questions, only in deciding how our codes of conduct apply to the behavior of our kids rather than deciding how criminal or international law apply to the behavior of citizens and nations.

Practice 2) When there is disagreement, we do not resist with "force" what we consider to be bad.

Unfortunately, like the tenure example just discussed, our code of conduct is subject to judgment and discretion. This is the reason for staff dialogues. In those cases that go beyond the clear interpretation of written laws, the aim of staff dialogues is for, as much as possible, decisions in `The Math Movement` "to observe those unwritten laws whose sanction lies only in the universal feeling of what is right…" (Pericles in Thucydides (1972)).

The goal of dialogues is to determine what is the group's universal feeling of what is right, and by so doing to find solutions that everyone actively supports - or at least can live with. While consensus will emerge from dialogues in some cases, in other cases decisions will need to be made without a consensus on the right course of action. When disagreement remains there is a delicate balance between those in disagreement respecting the ultimate decision and the final decision-maker respecting the remaining disagreement. The three practices for generating dialogues discussed in Section 1.2 are aimed at clarifying the sources of any disagreement, and Practice 3 below is aimed at allowing decisions to made that "respect" disagreement. Practices 2 and 3 in this Section must go together, as you cannot have one without the other.

Practice 3) When there is disagreement, we make decisions with forbearance and socialized power.

When disagreement persists, one director will be responsible for the group decision. This means that we do not make consensus decisions in the sense of requiring agreement (Conradt and Roper (2005)). However, this does not mean that the director with ultimate responsibility simply gets to impose their way. Even when we must make a binary decision, 0 or 1, we try to convexify the decision as much as possible in the directions of remaining concern, and along whatever dimensions doing so is possible. That is, even when facing a 0 or 1 question, in the face of disagreement we try to make our answer lie somewhere between 0 and 1 in whatever ways possible. This approach is based in the world view starting this document that we are all expressions of the same effort, and so we would like to find a way of combining everyone's experiences and perspectives.

As just described, our second practice for making group decisions under disagreement is that we respect the group's ultimate decision, even when we disagree with it. In order for this second practice to work, those with power to make a final decision must exercise forbearance:

> Forbearance is self-restraint in the exercise of power. It is not fully taking advantage of a legal right that is open to you. And that seems odd, and maybe counterintuitive, but think about some of the things that American politicians can legally do... The president can pardon anybody he or she wants at any time. The president can also pack the Supreme Court – if the president has a majority in Congress, doesn't like the ideological makeup of the Supreme Court, the president can legally expand the court to eleven, or thirteen, fill it with allies, suddenly have a majority – all he or she needs is a majority in Congress to do that. The president – and this is an issue that came up quite a bit at the end of the Obama presidency – if he or she is not getting their agenda through Congress can use different kinds of mechanisms, like executive orders, proclamations to essentially govern or implement policy at the margins of Congress.
>
> Now, think quickly about what Congress can do: Congress can block every single nomination – the Senate can block every single nomination the president makes: To the Cabinet, to, obviously, the Supreme Court, as we know. Congress can, as we saw recently, shut down the government – can refuse to fund the government.
>
> So if our political leaders, according to this constitution, can legally make our country ungovernable, can make our system of checks and balances – which are so brilliantly designed – can make them completely dysfunctional, if not ridden with crises, it takes what we call forbearance. It takes an agreement, among the major politicians, that one is not going to use one's institutional prerogative to the hilt. They're not going to use a filibuster on every bill. They're not going to pardon all of their friends, all of the time. They're not going to block every single Supreme Court nominee the president has. That kind of restraint is essential to a democratic system.
>
> –Klein et al. (2018), 21:46–23:47

Much as this document started with a discussion of the power of love and the power of fear, McClelland (1970) makes a similar differentiation between socialized power and personalized power.

Forbearance is both *a practice for cultivating* and *an expression of* socialized power. The study of power and management in McClelland and Burnham (2003) "concluded that the top manager of a company must possess a high need for power – that is, a concern for influencing people. However, this need must be disciplined and controlled so that it is directed toward the benefit of the institution as a whole and not toward the manager's personal aggrandizement."[1]

3 Building and Maintaining Trust Among Senior Staff

3.1 Overview

Senior staff members will have to trust each other if `The Math Movement` is going to run effectively. Trust will be critical for staff dialogues to operate as discussions that consider all ramifications of potential choices. Without trust, points of view will not be appropriately considered, and dialogues will become less about examining alternative decisions together and more about explaining the decision already made in one director's mind. Trust will also be critical for learning from our mistakes. Delicate interactions with students, parents, and institutional representative will occur often, and more often than not, will require a quick reaction so that the engaged director will have to act without the ability to consult other directors. With trust, directors will approach these moments openly and will be able to discuss these spur-of-the-moment decisions constructively rather than defensively. Without trust, we will not be able to learn together from these experiences.

Before talking about our methods for building and maintaining trust, let's first establish the basis for trust:

> To safely and reliably allow others to act on our behalf – which is what we mean by trusting them – we must be able to count on three underpinnings: Character, Competence, and Authority.
>
> - **Character** means that those we trust will value our interests as their own.
> - **Competence** means that those we trust have the requisite intelligence, ability, and training to achieve our best interests.
> - **Authority** means that those we trust are empowered to deliver on promises.
>
> When all three conditions are present, trust develops naturally, almost reflexively. But when any of the three is absent, trust must take a holiday. To trust in the absence of any of these three elements is not smart but naïve – and eventual betrayal is almost certain.
>
> Those who meet these three conditions for being granted our trust (Character + Competence + Authority) almost always possess a broader view of life's purpose than merely securing the best personal outcome in every single outcome in every single transaction, in every conversation, in every negotiation. People who see life as a marathon rather than

[1] Literature on socialized and personalized power can be found in Magee and Langner (2008), Torelli and Shavitt (2010), and Bunderson and Reagans (2011). Note also that the next line in McClelland and Burnham (2003) is "the top manager's need for power ought to be greater than his or her need to be liked."

> a sprint, as a narrative in which everything eventually connects, are the best bets for long-term trust. These individuals tend to have an enlightened, all-things-considered self-interest. They choose to act in the belief that trustworthy behavior pays dividends, if only in the harmony that comes from a lifetime of durable, high-trust relationships. Possessing a bone-deep belief that they are accountable to more than just their own interests, they are simply unlikely to betray another's trust.
>
> –Peterson (2016), pp 9-10, 12

3.2 Practices for Building Trust among Senior Staff

Practice 1) We engage in practice dialogues during the academic year before camp starts.

We read books together and then discuss ethical dilemmas that arise. These discussions can occur over lunch or coffee, and are motivated by the idea of Books at Work. These conversations are extremely important because they allow us to build trust by learning about each other's **character** and areas of **competence**. These discussions are predisposed to being constructive because they are about other people. This facilitates us opening up to each other, which helps each of us learn where others are coming from in terms of experiences and habits of the mind.

These discussions serve as practice dialogues. We could discuss, for example, how we as a camp should respond to character X who does Y in book Z, or character A who does B in book C. Practicing dialogues before camp starts, and when the consequences are hypothetical rather than real, gives us an opportunity to establish clear norms for discussion and interaction.

Practice 2) Not if, but when we betray each other's trust, we acknowledge the betrayal and fix it as soon as possible.

As a working organization made up of human beings, it is inevitable that we will end up betraying each other's trust. When we are the recipient of such a betrayal, it is useful to recall John Mellencamp's lyric on forgiveness: "When I think of all the wrong I've done, I can't believe it's me that I'm talking about. I bet the same goes for you..."

When we are the party who has betrayed the trust of another, we should first acknowledge the betrayal (Tutu (1999)), and after coming to terms with whether it was due to character – not having the other person's interest at heart, competence – not getting the job done, or authority – not being in a position to affect the result, we should try to fix it as soon as possible.

References

Al-Najjar, N. I., L. Anderlini, and L. Felli (2006). Undescribable events. *The Review of Economic Studies 73*(4), 849–868.

Bodhipaksa (2007). *Is meditation about making your mind go blank?* Wildmind Buddhist Meditation.

Bunderson, J. S. and R. E. Reagans (2011). Power, status, and learning in organizations. *Organization Science 22*(5), 1182–1194.

Conradt, L. and T. J. Roper (2005). Consensus decision making in animals. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution 20*(8), 449 – 456.

Duhigg, C. (2016). What Google learned from its quest to build the perfect team. *The New York Times Magazine*.

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly 44*(2), 350–383.

Gandhi, M. (1909). Brute Force. In *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, Volume 10. Gandhi Sevagram Ashram.

Gandhi, M. (1962). *The Essential Gandhi.* New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Hogeveen, J., M. Inzlicht, and S. S. Obhi (2014). Power changes how the brain responds to others. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General 143*(2), 755–762.

King, Jr., M. L. (1998). *The Autobiography of Martin Luther King, Jr.* Warner Books.

Kissinger, H. (1995). *Diplomacy.* Simon & Schuster.

Klein, E., S. Levitsky, and D. Ziblatt (2018, January 29). *How Democracies Die.* Vox: The Ezra Klein Show.

Magee, J. C. and C. A. Langner (2008). How personalized and socialized power motivation facilitate antisocial and prosocial decision-making. *Journal of Research in Personality 42*(6), 1547 – 1559.

Manski, C. (2016). Policy analysis in a post-truth world. *VoxEU.org*.

Manski, C. F. (2013). *Public Policy in an Uncertain World: Analysis and Decisions.* Harvard University Press.

McClelland, D. C. (1970). The two faces of power. *Journal of International Affairs*, 29–47.

McClelland, D. C. and D. H. Burnham (2003). Power is the great motivator. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2003/01/power-is-the-great-motivator.

Mercier, H. and D. Sperber (2017). *The Enigma of Reason: A New Theory of Human Understanding*. Harvard University Press.

Peterson, J. (2016). *The 10 Laws of Trust: Building the Bonds That Make a Business Great*. AMACOM. With David A. Kaplan.

Plato (1987). *Gorgias*. Hackett. Translated by Donald J. Zeyl.

Pollan, M. (2018). *How to Change Your Mind: What the New Science of Psychedelics Teaches Us about Consciousness, Dying, Addiction, Depression, and Transcendence*. Penguin Press.

Power, S. (2000). *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide*. Basic Books.

Surowiecki, J. (2005). *The Wisdom of Crowds*. Anchor.

Thucydides (1972). *History of the Peloponnesian War*. Penguin Classics. Translated by Rex Warner.

Tolstoy, L. (1984). *The Kingdom of God is Within You: Christianity Not as a Mystic Religion but as a New Theory of Life*. University of Nebraska Press.

Torelli, C. J. and S. Shavitt (2010). Culture and concepts of power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 99*(4), 703.

Tutu, D. (1999). *No Future without Forgiveness*. Doubleday.

Walter, B. F. (2015). Why bad governance leads to repeat civil war. *Journal of Conflict Resolution 59*(7), 1242–1272.

Woolley, A. W., C. F. Chabris, A. Pentland, N. Hashmi, and T. W. Malone (2010). Evidence for a collective intelligence factor in the performance of human groups. *Science 330*(6004), 686–688.

Wrong, M. (2010). *It's Our Turn to Eat: The Story of a Kenyan Whistle-Blower*. Harper Perennial.

X, M. (1987). *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*. Ballantine Books.

A Elaborating on Different Forms of Power

A.1 The Power of Status and Fear

The power of status and fear does not care about morality and is about exerting control over others for one's own ends. This is, unfortunately, a form of power that has been used a lot throughout space and time, and using this type of power affects how we see the world (Hogeveen et al. (2014)). This power is the basis for *realpolitik* as defined in Kissinger (1995), is the aim of sophistry as defined by Socrates in the dialogue *Gorgias*, and is exemplified in historical quotes like:

- "Power grows out of the barrel of a gun;"
- "The strong do what they want, and the weak suffer what they must;"
- "The constitution is made of paper, but the bayonet is made of steel."

When politicians operate in terms of the power of status and fear, their behavior is typically summarized by the phrase "It's our turn to eat" (Wrong (2010)). This type of power fights against any form of accountability, which can lead to endless power grabs and civil wars (Walter (2015)), and is a major reason many countries do not fully develop. You can see this behavior when politicians jockey amongst even their friends and allies for the smallest advantage, all so they can exercise this type of power and advance their perceived, narrow "self interest."

A.2 The Power of Love

GANDHI: . . . Why do you want to drive away the English?
READER: Because India has become impoverished by their Government. They take away our money from year to year. The most important posts are reserved for themselves. We are kept in a state of slavery. They behave insolently towards us and disregard our feelings.

GANDHI: If they do not take our money away, become gentle, and give us responsible posts, would you still consider their presence to be harmful?
READER: That question is useless. It is similar to the question whether there is any harm in associating with a tiger if he changes his nature. Such a question is sheer waste of time. When a tiger changes his nature, Englishmen will change theirs. This is not possible. . .

GANDHI: Supposing we get Self-Government similar to what the Canadians and the South Africans have, will it be good enough?
READER: That question is also useless. We may get it when we have the same powers; we shall then hoist our own flag. As is Japan, so must be India. We must own our own navy, our army, and we must have our own splendor, and then will India's voice ring throughout the world.

GANDHI: You have well drawn the picture. In effect it means this: that we want English rule without the Englishman. You want the tiger's nature, but not the tiger; that is to say, you would make India English. And when it becomes English, it will be called not Hindustan but Englistan. This is not the Swaraj [Home Rule] that I want.

"If it is change from white military rule to a brown, we hardly need make any fuss..."

–Gandhi (1962)

Humanity is waiting for something other than blind imitation of the past. If we want truly to advance a step further, if we want to turn over a new leaf and really set a new man afoot, we must begin to turn mankind away from the long and desolate night of violence. May it not be that the new man the world needs is the nonviolent man? Longfellow said, "In this world a man must either be an anvil or a hammer." We must be hammers shaping a new society rather than anvils molded by the old. This not only will make us new men, but will give us a new kind of power. It will not be Lord Acton's image of power that tends to corrupt or absolute power that corrupts absolutely. It will be power infused with love and justice, that will change dark yesterdays into bright tomorrows, and lift us from the fatigue of despair to the buoyancy of hope. A dark, desperate, confused, and sin-sick world waits for this new kind of man and this new kind of power.

–King (1998), p 332